

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1 - 35 are pending in the application. Claim 36 is canceled. These amendments are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Claims rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1- 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Leonard. This rejection is overcome by a declaration of inventors under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131.

Claims 1- 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Prince. This rejection is overcome by a declaration of inventors under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131.

Claims 1- 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Huang. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Huang discloses a system for virtualizing super user privileges for multiple processes that is a different technology than the one claimed by applicants. Huang discloses the virtual process manager program (see 131 in FIG. 1). Huang teaches:

“...the virtual process manager program 131 can be implemented as a modified loader program. A loader program is an operating system utility that is used to execute computer programs that are stored on static media.” (column 7, lines 50-55).

The process manager of Huang is merely an application launcher that loads and initiates processes, including virtual processes. It is certainly not the claimed “designated Virtual Private Server (VPS) with a set of services that perform administrative operations.”

Also, the Office Action cites col. 7 (which discusses a wrapper) as allegedly disclosing a VPS being dedicated to administrative services. However, Huang’s wrapper is not a VPS, and does not handle administrative operations for VPSs. Rather, the wrapper is conceptually somewhat analogous to a DLL (for the purpose of handling some system calls). Huang’s wrapper is essentially a mechanism for intercepting system API calls and substituting, where necessary, a different routine for handling that system call.

On the other hand, amended independent claims 1, 17 and 32 recite “a designated Virtual Private Server (VPS), wherein the designated VPS provides administrative service to each of the server processes...” Huang does not teach the designated VPS providing administrative services to each of the server processes. Those of ordinary skill in the art would not equate a loader program (or a wrapper) of Huang with a designated administrative VPS, since the process manager of Huang is not a virtualized component like a VPS. Rather, the virtual process manager of Huang is a regular programmable component that is essentially a redirector of some system calls.

Furthermore, amended independent claims 1, 17 and 32 recite that that the designated VPS is isolated by a logical, physical or namespace isolation of processes. The Office Action on page 18 contends that VPS isolation is taught in Huang in column 7. However, no mention of VPS and its isolation can be found in column 7. Therefore, Huang does not teach the

administrative isolated VPS recited in the amended independent claims 1, 17 and 32. Accordingly, these claims are not anticipated by Huang for this additional reason.

Referring to claims 7, 10, 11, 22, 25 and 31 Huang does not teach any of administrative services recited in these claims, contrary to the Office Action stating (for example, on page 16) that services like collection of statistics, servicing of requests for management, servicing requests for resource allocation etc. are disclosed in column 6 of Huang. Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to point out the specific passages of Huang that explicitly teach any of the services recited in these claims, or to withdraw the rejection.

Likewise, referring to claims 8, 9, 23 and 24 reciting multiplexing performed using separation of requests, the Office Action relies on col. 6 of Huang. However, no teaching or a discussion of multiplexing can be found in column 6. Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to point out the specific passage of Huang that explicitly teaches multiplexing recited in these claims, or to withdraw the rejection.

The differences between the claimed invention and the prior art of record are clearly reflected in the proposed amendment of the claims. Therefore, all pending claims are believed to be in the condition for allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for

any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BARDMESSER LAW GROUP

/GB/

George S. Bardmesser
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,020

Date: December 4, 2008

1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-1191